

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 19-25 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-13, 19, 20, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zaharkin (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747) (hereinafter "Zaharkin").

Claims 2, 3, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, in view of Sorge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,613,098) (hereinafter "Sorge").

Claims 10, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin.

Regarding independent claims 1, 19, 22 and 24, the Office Action relies on p. 2, para. 26 of Zaharkin as disclosing "transformation parameters determining *a desired presentation style and content structure*." The "configuration file," as disclosed in the recited portion of Zaharkin, "describ[es] how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator 240 operate[s]." An example is provided that the "configuration file" specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file. Zaharkin does not disclose that the "configuration file" contains "transformation parameters determining *a desired presentation style and content structure*," as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 24.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action relies on the combination of Zaharkin and Sorge as teaching "a preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules."

In particular, the Office Action points to col. 12, lines 35-67 and col. 13, lines 1-34 of Sorge. The recited portions of Sorge disclose resolving formatting conflicts between how data is displayed in “EXCEL 2000” and HTML. (Sorge, col. 12, lines 38-40). Nothing in the recited portion of Sorge teaches or suggests “resolving conflicts arising *due to said transformation parameters*,” as claimed in claim 1. The arguments provided above for claim 1 apply, at least in part, to claim 22.

It should be noted that the Office Action relies on the argument that the Examiner is to give a claim its broadest reasonable interpretation without reading limitations of the specification. However, the Examiner cannot simply view claim limitations in a vacuum; rather, the Examiner must view the claim limitations in light of the specification and one skilled in the art. The Office Action states that “Sorge teaches a format conflict resolving method...for the specific purpose of transforming parameters of a spreadsheet data document into compatible parameters of the end-HTML markup file” However, claim 1 claims “transformation parameters *determining a desired presentation style and content structure of an output document*.” The recited portions of Sorge do not teach or suggest the claimed “transformation parameters,” and thus, do not teach or suggest “conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters.”

Regarding claim 19, Zaharkin and Sorge, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest “a management processor (a) for receiving user-provided input data selecting a second format from a plurality of selectable formats for presentation on a display device, and (b) for receiving user-provided transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout and content structure.” Regarding claim 24, Zaharkin and Sorge, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest “receiving a

user-provided input document in a first format; receiving a user-selected second format from a plurality of selectable formats; receiving a user-selected template document from a plurality of selectable template documents; receiving user-provided transformation parameters corresponding to the template document, the transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout and content structure.”

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 19, 22 and 24 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over Zaharkin and Sorge, individually and in combination. The corresponding dependent claims are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons given for the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 and 19-25 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Donald B. Paschburg  
Donald B. Paschburg  
Reg. No. 33,753  
Attorney for Applicants

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor – IPD Dept.  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3191